



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,543	09/19/2005	Francois Lhermite	ONS00541	1655
27255 7590 06/16/2008 SEMICONDUCTOR COMPONENTS INDUSTRIES, LLC ATTN: ROBERT D. ATKINS/LAW DEPT./MD 1700 P.O. BOX 62890 PHOENIX, AZ 85082-2890				
EXAMINER MOFFAT, JONATHAN				
ART UNIT 2863		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 06/16/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 5/2/2008 after final rejection, with respect to claims 3, 6, 9-10 and 16 and those with respect to claims 8 and 20 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 3, 8, 10, 16 and 20 with respect to 35 U.S.C. 112 1st paragraph has been withdrawn. Claims 6 and 9, additionally rejected for different reasons, are discussed below and remain rejected.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 5, 7, 11-15 and 17-19, filed 5/2/2008 after final rejection, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 13-14 of applicant's arguments, applicant argued that the examiner misrepresented the limitations of claims 18-19 and further that figure 1 item 52 shows an amplifier and that figure 1 item 56 shows a comparator as called for in claims 18-19. The examiner agrees that the identified items are indeed an amplifier and comparator, but respectfully disagrees that the language of the claims are shown in the drawings. Amplifier 52 in figure 1 receives 2 inputs, a reference voltage and a signal which is a sum of the output voltage and the input power. However, this amplifier DOES NOT "receive the power signal and the feedback signal" as claim 18 demands. The amplifier input signal (at node 55) is the sum of the power and output voltage and IS NOT the same as "the power signal" and/or "the feedback signal". Even if the signal at node 55 were considered to be "the feedback signal", "the power signal" is still not fed into amplifier 52.

On page 15 of the response, applicant argues that claims 6 and 9 are not identical in scope. The applicant points out that claim 9 contains an additional element not in claim 6 of "a

power factor feedback signal". The examiner respectfully disagrees that labeling the same signal differently between two claims comprises a difference in scope as the signal itself is the same and although applicant is permitted to be his own lexicographer, a label is not an "additional element" with respect to claim scope.

On page 16 of the response, applicant argues that the examiner is relying upon personal knowledge and respectfully requests an affidavit from the examiner. The examiner respectfully disagrees with this assessment of the rejection. The knowledge relied upon in this situation is not that of the examiner, but that of the prior art of record and the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art.

On pages 16-18, applicant argues against the combination of references Brown ('730) and Brown ('901). As detailed in the previous office action, base reference Brown ('730) discloses an input power and voltage be monitored in order to regulate the output power. Teaching reference Brown ('901) teaches that input voltage and power should be multiplied together to form an input power measurement in order to monitor the output power (abstract). The examiner agrees with applicant that "monitoring output power" is not the same as "multiplying input current and voltage to get input power" or "regulating output power". However, this was never asserted by the examiner. What is being asserted is that the base reference teaches "regulating an output voltage of the power supply system" using values of the input side including voltage and current. The teaching reference teaches that it is desirable to multiply the input voltage and current together to form an input power which has use for monitoring the output power. The teaching reference is not required to state that the output voltage of the power supply be regulated and the base reference is not required to state that the

input voltage and current be multiplied. The requirements of 35 U.S.C. 103 state that the invention as a whole must be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention in view of the prior art. In this case, the prior art contains the disclosures of both Brown ('730), Brown ('901) and ordinary knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art which motivates the combination of the above patents as obvious as it is well known in the art to multiply voltage and current to get power. Power is defined as the product of voltage and current and so is well within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, all of the elements of the claims are present in the cited patents requiring no leaps in logic beyond combination to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants arguments on pages 19-22, with respect to the remaining claims, concern the above rejection of Brown ('730) in view of Brown ('901).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 8, 10, 16 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record is not found to disclose or suggest the addition of a feedback voltage from the supply-side of a power supply system with the input power of said power supply system as in claims 3, 6, 9-10 and 16. Further, the prior art of record is not found to disclose or suggest the division of the input power signal by the output feedback signal as in claims 8 and 20.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JONATHAN MOFFAT whose telephone number is (571)272-2255. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, from 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached on (571) 272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/jm/
5/20/2008
JM
/Bryan Bui/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2863